



**LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION
TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVE GRANT PROGRAM
CONTINUATION (THIRD) WEB SITE GRANT FINAL REPORT**

Background and Instructions

Submission of this Narrative Final Report (Narrative Report) meets the final reporting requirements for LSC Continuation (Third) grants for Statewide Web Sites (SWWS).

LSC seeks information about grantees' SWWS so it can:

1. Effectively assess the range of SWWS systems, approaches and strategies funded through the Technology Initiative Grant (TIG) program,
2. Help legal services grantees identify and implement the SWWS systems and approaches that can most effectively strengthen their ability to serve clients, and
3. Demonstrate the ways and extent to which SWWS can improve clients' access to services and/or the efficiency and effectiveness of services LSC-grantees provide clients.

Information should be provided for the client, advocate and pro bono components of the SWWS.

The Narrative Report should include narrative information and pertinent qualitative and statistical information, and, as appropriate, should present data in tabular or graphic formats. Grantees may include appendices that present graphic, tabular and other information which document their projects' accomplishments and activities. Grantees may find it useful to provide supporting documentation in attachments. For example, a grantee may wish to provide significant survey data that are not included in the text because of space considerations. In this example, the attachments would include the responses (in percent and number) in each response category of a question. Continuing with this example, for a question with a yes-no response, the number and percent of yes and no responses should be provided. Grantees should use their discretion in determining those data that should be provided in any attachments.

Please note that the information collected through the Web site evaluation surveys should be a valuable source of information for this report. These surveys are the Advocate Web site evaluation surveys, the Client Web site evaluation surveys and the Client User survey. Much of the information requested should have been provided in the milestone reporting. That information should be included here as well so LSC can have these Web site data in a single report.

LSC realizes that it may be unfeasible for some grantees to submit all of the information requested for the Narrative Report. In those cases, the grantee should identify the missing information and explain why it cannot provide these data. LSC seeks to understand why requested data are unavailable so it can explore options for



generating this information. Possible reasons why the grantee may not be able to provide the requested information can include but are not limited to:

1. Insufficient resources to support the staff time needed to accomplish the identified tasks,
2. Lack of necessary staff expertise,
3. The short time the site (or its key components) has been operational, and
4. The absence of baseline data collected when the site was first implemented.

To facilitate grantees' ability to provide the requested evaluative information, LSC will, as necessary, work with grantees in areas including, but not limited to:

1. Clarifying evaluation requirements,
2. Identifying best practices,
3. Referrals to grantees that have conducted exemplary evaluations, and
4. Assisting to educate executive directors and other managers about the importance of evaluation.

Note that the third web site grant milestones do not require that evaluation results meet specific standards. LSC staff do not anticipate that these evaluation results will influence any subsequent web site grant decisions.

This report should **not** be submitted on the online reporting system for web site evaluation surveys. Instead, it should be submitted on the grant online milestone reporting system on which milestone information is submitted for all grants, regardless of whether they are web site or non-web site grants.

Please present the report's information in each of the designated sections. Do not exceed the maximum page lengths specified for each section. (Appendices are not included in the maximum page calculations.)

For questions about the Continuation Web Site Grant final report, contact Bristow Hardin, LSC Program Analyst (202-295-1553; hardinb@lsc.gov), or Taylor Healy, LSC Program Analyst (202-295-1565; healyt@lsc.gov).



Continuation (Third) Web Site Grant Final Report

Grantee Name:

TIG Grant #:

Date report submitted:

Contact Person:

Telephone:

Email address:

As noted in the Instructions, the following information should be provided for the client, advocate and pro bono components of the SWWS, as appropriate. Additionally, *LSC realizes that grantees may not have all of the information requested in the report.* In those cases where requested information is missing, the grantee should identify the information that it lacks and explain why that information is not available. Refer to the Instructions for more information about reporting missing information.

I. Project Goals (maximum 1 page). Identify specific goals that were developed for the Web Site Continuation grant that were based on the assessment of the activities and accomplishments of the Renewal (Second) Web site grant. Describe any significant changes in the goals that were made during the course of the project.

II. Web Site Description (maximum 2 pages). Describe the development history and the current status of the web site. Discuss information such as:

1. Template choice.
2. Launch dates.
3. The breadth and depth of content on the client, advocate, and pro bono components, such as the number of legal resources and the substantive areas in which these materials are available. (Much of this information should have been provided in the milestone reporting).
4. Actions taken to ensure that materials serve Limited English Proficiency (LEP) populations.
5. Multimedia capacities, such as text, audio, video and streaming video, animation tools, webcasting, or webcast archive tools.
6. Availability of document assembly systems, such as, but not limited to, HotDocs, ICAN! and AJS. (If document assembly is available, include the number of advocate forms and the number of client forms.)
7. Existing standards and quality control practices. (Much of this information should have been provided in the milestone reporting.)
8. Usability and usefulness. (This information can be obtained from the Web site evaluation surveys or similar surveys).



III. Major Accomplishments (maximum 2 pages). Provide an overall assessment of the quality of the SWWS. Also discuss the extent to which the goals identified in Section I that were accomplished as well as any significant unanticipated accomplishments. Incorporate into your assessment appropriate references to the information contained in Section II above or in Section IV below.

IV. Assessment of Web Site (maximum 4 pages). Provide your assessment of the web site. Report on the data identified below as well as any other relevant information for the client, advocate and pro bono components.¹ Grantees should identify the methods and data that they use in their assessment. Further, because of space considerations, grantees may need to provide supporting documentation in attachments. (Refer to the instructions for more information about this.)

The “potential questions” identify the types of issues that grantees should consider in their analysis and are listed in order to serve as a starting point for grantees’ assessments.

Data	Potential Questions	Finding This Information
Visitors	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Are there any trends developing?• Has the number of visitors increased over time?• Are there large increases during particular months or after particular events?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review visitor statistics over time. The web site coordinator or circuit rider will have access to these statistics.
Page Views	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Are there any trends developing?• Has the number of page views increased over time?• Are there large increases during particular months or after particular events?• What content receives the most views?• Has this changed over time?• What subject area received the most views?• Has this changed over time?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review page view statistics over time. The web site coordinator or circuit rider will have access to these statistics.• Review the LSC Matters Reporting System (MSR) data that each LSC grantee is required to generate on an annual basis.
User Feedback (Clients & Program Staff)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• What have users said about the usability and utility of the web site?• Has the web site helped low-income web site visitors solve their problems?• Has the web site increased the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of pro bono attorneys? In what ways?• Has the web site increased the efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Use client interview data from previous client web site evaluations.• Use advocate survey data from previous advocate web site evaluations.• Updated surveys of advocates or clients.

¹ For each major data category, potential sources for the data are listed. If the data cannot be obtained from these or additional sources, please explain why these data are not available.



	and cost-effectiveness of administrative staff? In what ways?	• Surveys of administrative staff.
	• Has the web site increased the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of program advocates? In what ways?	
Key Stakeholder Interviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• How has service delivery changed because of the web sites?• How are the web sites being used in intake, brief services, and referrals?• How have partnerships between courts, community groups, and other organizations changed because of the web sites?	• As necessary and appropriate, talk with, interview, and /or survey the web site coordinator and other key project stakeholders.

Any other information the grantee considers important.

V. Partnerships. Discuss the ways and the extent to which partnerships with the courts, community groups and other organizations have increased the quality of the web site. Discuss information such as:

1. Partners' assistance in the design, implementation and content of the site.
2. The extent to which partners have increased access to the web site through marketing and outreach, establishing computer stations where clients can access the Internet, content development, and so on.

Discuss any financial or in-kind support in Section VI below.

V. Financial and in-kind support for the web site (maximum 2 pages). Provide estimates of the following:

1. The financial and in-kind resources devoted to supporting the development and on-going implementation of the web site that *exceeded* the total amount of the first and second TIG web site grants.
2. The entity (or entities) that provided the resources identified in the previous bullet.
3. The expenses paid and activities supported by the financial and in-kind resources received from all sources (i.e., the amount of web site grants and the resources provided from all other sources).

VI. Major lessons and recommendations (maximum 3 pages). Address factors such as:

1. The most significant lessons you learned.
2. Recommendations you have for other grantees.